

**To:** Smith, Claudia[Smith.Claudia@epa.gov]; Gilbert, Alexas[Gilbert.Alexas@epa.gov]; Rothery, Deirdre[Rothery.Deirdre@epa.gov]  
**From:** Dresser, Chris  
**Sent:** Mon 4/18/2016 2:23:02 PM  
**Subject:** RE: U&O FIP: Updated Cost Numbers using CTG

If we're okay with this approach for dealing with the changes, I will go ahead and make the necessary changes to the FR notice and TSD. I can have the updated version complete by COB today.

-Chris

Chris Dresser

U.S. EPA – Region 8

1595 Wynkoop Street

Denver, Colorado 80202-1129

Phone: (303) 312-6385

**From:** Smith, Claudia  
**Sent:** Monday, April 18, 2016 8:19 AM  
**To:** Gilbert, Alexas <Gilbert.Alexas@epa.gov>; Dresser, Chris <Dresser.Chris@epa.gov>; Rothery, Deirdre <Rothery.Deirdre@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: U&O FIP: Updated Cost Numbers using CTG

No concerns here. It will probably have to change again before the final, given the final CTG in June.

Thanks,

Claudia

**From:** Gilbert, Alexas

**Sent:** Thursday, April 14, 2016 5:16 PM

**To:** Smith, Claudia <[Smith.Claudia@epa.gov](mailto:Smith.Claudia@epa.gov)>; Dresser, Chris <[Dresser.Chris@epa.gov](mailto:Dresser.Chris@epa.gov)>;  
Rothery, Deirdre <[Rothery.Deirdre@epa.gov](mailto:Rothery.Deirdre@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** U&O FIP: Updated Cost Numbers using CTG

Hi All-

Here is the total cost number using the CTG numbers for **quarterly** as well as **semi annual** inspections: **\$83,115,662**

The previous number (**\$84,155,591**) was generated by multiplying the cost of LDAR per facility by 2.

They are pretty similar, I think we might use the CTG numbers for VOC reduced for the emission estimates so, unless there's a concern with using this new number – I think **\$83,115,662** is the number we should use.

The spreadsheet outlining the calculation for this number is "Draft Cost Analysis Numbers2 4.14.16" on the I drive.

Thoughts? Concerns?

Thanks-

Alexas